DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 100 871 95 SP 008 787

TITLE Minorities in Policy-Making Positions in Public Education.
INSTITUTION Recruitment Leadership and Training Inst., Philadelphia, Pa.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Nov 74
NOTE 78p.; A Position Paper

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$4.20 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Decision Making; *Educational Administration; *Educational Policy; Higher Education; *Job Placement; *Minority Groups; Policy Formation; Surveys

ABSTRACT

This report delineates the degree and nature of minority participation in effective, policy-making positions on administrative levels and proposes steps to further the hiring of minorities for these positions. Part 1, "Minorities in the Schools: A Backward Glance," discusses the history of blacks in administrative positions since 1961. Part 2, "Minorities in City and School District Populations," summarizes the developing opportunities for minorities in the field of education, using data from a 48-city survey to examine the population currently served by the public schools in these cities. Part 3, "Minority Educators in Policy-Making Positions, 1974," identifies positions held by minority group members. Part 4 discusses traditional and minority-related policy-making positions, and part 5 refers to the employment picture in higher education. Conclusions and recommendations comprise part 6. A list of black professors in departments of educational administration, institutions offering fellowships for managers of educational change, member institutions of the Consortium for Educational Leadership, and member institutions of the National Program for Education Leadership are appended. (PD)

ED100871

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Minorities in Policy-Making Positions in Public Education

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A Position Paper
Prepared by the
Recruitment
Leadership and
Training Institute
November, 1974

ED 100870

The Recruitment Leadership and Training Institute

The Recruitment LTI is a panel which provides technical and developmental assistance to projects funded under the Education Professions Development Act, P.L. 90-35, Part A, Section 504, New Careers in Education Program and administered by the Division of Educational Systems Development, U.S. Office of Education.

Dr. Eunice A. Clarke
Director, LTI
Assistant Vice President
Research and Program
Development
Temple University
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Dr. Irving Rosenstein
Assistant Director, LTI
Temple University
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Panel Members

Mr. Warren H. Bacon
Assistant Director
Industrial Relations
Inland Steel Company
Chicago, Illinois

Mrs. Christine J. Moore, Dean
Student Personnel Services
Harbor Campus
Community College of
Baltimore
Baltimore, Maryland

Mrs. Jean Sampson, Trustee
University of Maine
Lewiston, Maine

Dr. James W. Kelley
Director of Urban Affairs
St. Cloud State College
St. Cloud, Minnesota

Mr. Edward V. Moreno
Principal
San Fernando High School
San Fernando, California

Mr. Farley J. Seldon
Principal
John Hay High School
Cleveland Public Schools
Cleveland, Ohio

Dr. Ronald W. Tyrrell
Chairman
Department of Intermediate Education
Cleveland State University
Cleveland, Ohio

Dr. Marian B. Warner
Supervisor
Business Education
School District of Philadelphia
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Professor Dorothy F. Williams
Chairman
Department of Communications
Simmons College
Boston, Massachusetts

The activity which is the subject of this report was supported in whole or in part by the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U.S. Office of Education should be inferred.

Table of Contents

	Preface	3
	Introduction	4
	Minorities in the Schools: A Backward Glance	8
	Minorities in City and School District Populations	13
	Minority Educators in Policy-Making Positions, 1974	22
	Traditional and Minority-Related Policy-Making Positions	32
	A Note on Higher Education	37
	Conclusions and Recommendations	41
	Footnotes	59
Appendices	Appendix A Black Professors in Departments of Educational Administration	60
	Appendix B Institutions Offering Fellowships for Managers of Educational Change	69
	Appendix C Consortium for Educational Leadership Member Institutions	72
	Appendix D National Program for Educational Leadership Member Institutions	73
List of Tables	Table I City and Student Populations with Minority Percentages of Each	15, 16, & 17
	Table II Grouping of Cities According to Minority Population of Cities	18, 19
	Table III Grouping of Cities According to Minority Population of Students in School District	20, 21
	Table IV Group I School Districts – 0-20% Minority Student Population	24
	Table V Group II School Districts – 20-40% Minority Student Population	25

Table VI Group III School Districts – 40-60% Minority Student Population 26
Table VII Group IV School Districts – 60-80% Minority Student Population 27
Table VIII Group V School Districts – 80-100% Minority Student Population 28
Table IX Distribution between Traditional and Minority-Related Positions 34
Table X Traditional Policy Positions Held by Minorities – Length of Time in Current Positions 36
Table XI Minority-Related Policy Positions – Length of Time in Current Positions 36
Table XII Administrative Positions Held by Blacks: Two-Year Institutions 39
Table XIII Administrative Positions Held by Blacks: Four-Year Institutions 40
Table XIV Percentages of Minority Full-Time Teachers 45

Preface

The Recruitment Leadership and Training Institute has, as part of its on-going responsibilities, monitored trends, gathered and analyzed data and offered recommendations in the general area of recruitment of personnel for the public schools. From its beginning, in 1970, the Recruitment LTI has been keenly interested in the status of minorities – students, parents, teachers and professionals – in the educational scene. This report focuses on administrators who are members of minority groups and attempts to identify those who have become educational decision-makers. It is based on research commissioned by the LTI and carried out by Dr. Bernard C. Watson, Chairman, Department of Urban Education, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, in early 1974, and it concludes with recommendations which reflect the views of the LTI panel members.

Although much of the discussion in this paper relies on the black experience, the history and current situation of other minority groups – Indians, Puerto Ricans, Chicanos, etc. – are equally important and, in many respects, similar. A detailed account of the progress of members of other groups in moving up in the education hierarchy must be left to a more comprehensive study; however, the LTI's conclusions apply to all minority groups, not only to blacks, who are the largest and, therefore, most visible.

Special appreciation is extended to Ms. Grace Watson, Coordinator of New Careers in Education Program, U.S. Office of Education.

Introduction

The decade from 1960 to 1970 was a period of turbulent social agitation and change. All American institutions, including the schools, were subjected to devastating criticism, battles for control, and proposals for reform. With the civil rights movement providing leadership at the grass roots level, and the Federal government holding out hope that the New Frontier might be conquered and the Great Society achieved, the entire country was forced to confront the question of just how far it was willing to go in implementing equal opportunity.

Like all revolutions, the turmoil of the sixties had its roots in developments which had been under way, quietly, but inexorably, for many years. On the one hand, there was urbanization. The pace of this phenomenon has accelerated in all the westernized countries during and after World War II. On the other hand, in the United States, this trend took a unique form with complex ramifications. Blacks, who, for generations following their emancipation, had remained largely in the South, moved to northern cities in search of better jobs and improved living conditions. And whites, all too often in reaction to the black influx into metropolitan centers, began moving out beyond the city limits. By the 1960's, social analysts at last realized what had happened: many American cities had become black centers, surrounded by a "noose" of white suburbs. And, in part, because of the limited educational and employment opportunities available to minorities, central cities were increasingly characterized by deteriorating physical facilities, dwindling tax resources, rising crime and larger welfare rolls.

While these vast demographic changes were taking place, a drama at another level was unfolding: the gradual recognition of what Swedish sociologist Gunnar Myrdal termed the "American dilemma," the enormous gap between the noblest American ideals and the reality of American life. Attempts

to resolve this dilemma had, of course, been carried on for many years by such organizations as the NAACP. However, victories were few and far between. Then, like a bomb exploding, the Supreme Court's 1954 *Brown vs. Topeka Board of Education* decision rocked the nation with the statement that separate-but-equal facilities for minorities were not only unequal but unconstitutional. In a single blow, the ground was cut from under policies and practices which had grown over the nearly sixty years since the *Plessy vs. Ferguson* decision, and the American people were required to reorder the way they treated one another, beginning in the schools. As the decade of the sixties opened, however, many people had become impatient at, if not outraged by, the slow pace of change. A coalition of white liberals and emerging black leaders undertook an active battle to attain voting rights, access to public facilities, and equal employment opportunities for members of minority groups.

The schools, the target of the Brown decision, quite understandably became the focus of the reformers' attention. Special programs were devised in an attempt to offset the "cultural disadvantages" and other problems which, it was said, prevented many children from succeeding in school. Efforts were made to bring facilities and instruction in poverty or minority area schools up to the level of those in middle-class communities. Revisions of and additions to the curriculum were made, incorporating previously neglected subjects such as black history. In all these and many other efforts at school reform, the Federal government played a key role, as an unprecedented amount of funds for public education was made available through such legislation as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

The most angry controversies, however, were over community control of the schools. Many whites seemed to forget that minorities were simply arguing for something which was

taken for granted in more affluent communities: the right of parents and community residents to participate in decisions affecting the education and welfare of the community's children. This right was not merely an abstract moral or legal concept, but a practical necessity: investigators have discovered that children are adversely affected by too great a contrast between the norms and values of home and school. Yet, many American schools were run with little or no comprehension of, let alone sympathy toward, the cultural background and traditions of the children. Indeed, in many areas it was thought to be the school's mission to stamp out differences, to "anglicize" or "Americanize" all students, regardless of the emotional trauma or the parents' wishes.

A key factor in whether a school or any institution, for that matter, is likely to be responsive to the needs and desires of its clientele is to be found in the composition of its administrative staff and board. While there is no guarantee that policy-makers from a given group can or will always act to advocate or defend the interests of that group, one might be justifiably suspicious of institutions claiming to serve minorities who had no representation at all at the highest levels of administration. The presence of teachers and administrators who are minority group members should not, of course, be restricted to schools in which the student population is heavily minority. Their presence is essential, ethically and educationally, in all schools. However, they have a crucial role to play as models of success for youngsters who may be exposed to few other professionals from their own ethnic group. Quite apart from these considerations, however, is the duty now established by law: that school districts take affirmative steps to recruit, promote and train minority group members to all positions where deficiencies currently exist.

Though the success or failure of minority group educators in moving into key positions in school district administrations

is only one small indicator of progress in the complex and prolonged battle for social justice in the United States, it is a critical one. This paper begins by briefly summarizing the developing opportunities for minorities in the field of education. Using data from a 48-city survey, it then examines the population currently served by the public schools in these cities and identifies positions held by minority group members. Reference is also made to the employment picture in higher education. Through its recommendations for additional action which must be taken, the Recruitment LTI hopes to make a small contribution toward the realization of equality of opportunity.

Minorities in the Schools: A Backward Glance

Traditionally, more black men and women turned to education as a career than to any other field.[1] Opportunities for both training and work were largely limited to professions which could be pursued within the black community: teaching, religion, medicine. Small wonder, then, that when new doors were opened at the insistence of civil rights leaders, there were few blacks or other minority group members prepared to move into graduate schools or jobs in, for instance, journalism, business or scientific research.

In the segregated schools of the nation, de jure in the South, de facto in the North, many devoted black teachers and principals spent lifetimes of endeavor. However, outside this closed system, blacks, especially in administrative positions, were a rarity. A 1961 study delineated the problem.

> The core of Negro administrative manpower is the segregated principalship. Best estimates place the number of Negro principals of segregated schools at 4,000, possibly more . . . . According to Dr. George N. Redd, Dean of Fisk University, there are less than a dozen Negro principals in non-segregated schools. "It is unusual," he says, "to find a Negro principal even in northern communities which have a number of Negro teachers. They are usually found in schools with practically an all-Negro student body and faculty."
>
> A few Negroes are now holding down district-wide responsibilities as assistant or associate superintendents. About twenty of them are currently working in northern and border states. They are not primarily concerned with racial problems in their districts.
>
> However, the fifty Negro associate superintendents and area supervisors in the Deep South and some border states

are primarily responsible for Negro schools in their districts and work directly under white superintendents.

At the top of the administrative ladder, the superintendency itself, the search for Negroes is all but fruitless. Arkansas has five Negro superintendents in charge of rural, all-Negro districts. Each district barely meets the state minimum of 350 students . . . . Although the administrator is called "superintendent," he is more nearly a supervising principal . . . .

Outside the South, the only Negro superintendent on the job is . . . in Lincoln Heights, Ohio [and he is]a successor to a line of Negro superintendents for the Lincoln Heights schools (population of 8,000 is 98% Negro).[2]

Early efforts to tie desegregation of administrative staff and faculty to student desegregation through court suits were made by black parents, not by teachers and administrators, a reflection of the high risk involved for black educators who "rocked the boat." Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act required that "students in a school district receiving federal financial assistance be afforded educational services free from discrimination on the ground of race, color, or national origin." A 1966 United States Supreme Court decision interpreted the act as barring assignment of teachers on a racially segregated basis and discrimination in the hiring, promotion, demotion, dismissal, or other treatment of faculty or staff. The Singleton rule (United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, January, 1970) stated that the southern school districts that had maintained dual systems, in the past, were required to assign staff so that the ratio of minority group population to majority group teachers in each school would be substantially the same as the ratio throughout the school district.[3]

Federal agencies such as the Office for Civil Rights of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission began to collect data on minority employment practices by school districts and to put pressure on those which were engaging in discrimination. The gathering of data itself became a critical aspect of attempts to improve employment opportunities for minorities. As researchers on the staff of *Overview* observed in 1961, "One significant gap in the whole area of opportunities for Negroes is the almost total lack of statistics . . . some northern districts make a point of not recording the race of its personnel, making an accurate analysis almost impossible."[4]

In spite of the variety of pressures exerted against discrimination by school systems, minority hiring in the 1960's moved at a snail's pace. As late as 1969, despite the large concentration of blacks in city school districts, not a single city school district had a black superintendent of schools. Newark, New Jersey, with a 78% non-white student enrollment, had one black administrator at the principalship level in 1968, and New York City, with over 500,000 non-white students, had only three black principals that year.[5] A report in the *Journal of Negro Education* (Spring, 1969) described the minority employment situation as follows:

> Many Negroes now function in such "safe" positions as vice-principals in preponderantly black schools, as principals in these same kinds of schools, or as staff officers such as subject matter specialists where little decision-making is required. These are "don't rock the boat" situations wherein a school system can congratulate itself for "integrating" its administrative hierarchy, and the Negro can satisfy himself that at least to a limited degree, he has "made it."[6]

School districts cited numerous reasons for the lack of high-level minority administrators, with most of the reasons relating in some way to recruitment difficulties. What might be called a basic primer on how to find and hire black administrators was presented in a 1969 article titled "The Elusive Black Educator."[7] The point of the article was clear: there is really no excuse for not being able to recruit black candidates for administrative positions; they exist, but school districts are finding what they want to find. A survey in 1970, however, indicated that not many districts had seriously attempted to find black administrators.

> Eighty-six per cent of the superintendents, for example, reported that their districts employed no black administrative personnel, but of the 86%, only 5% made recruiting efforts . . . . (One out of every five superintendents who had not employed blacks reported that their districts had a minimal or non-existent black population). . . .
>
> On the other hand, of the 14% who answered that they did employ black administrators, 70% said they had made some effort to recruit them. The percentage was the same – 14% – for those employing black officials and those who had actively recruited them.
>
> Asked to explain why they felt there were so few black administrators in the nation's schools, the majority of superintendents (57%) said they believed blacks lacked proper qualifications in areas of education or experience.[8]

Such a position was particularly curious in view of the upheaval involving Southern black principals and other administrators, who presumably had both "education and experience." As the segregated school systems of the South, under continuous legal pressure and threat of loss of Federal funds, gradually gave way to integrated ones, many black educators

found themselves demoted or actually dismissed. Samuel Etheridge of the National Education Association's Committee on Teacher Rights revealed some of the shocking results of school reorganization in a special 1972 report. In that school year alone, he said, 4,207 black educators in five southern states had been dismissed, demoted, assigned out of field or unsatisfactorily placed.[9]

A few scattered efforts were made in the early 1970's to recruit and train minority administrators but there has been no clear diagnosis of the problem or research to determine progress in the past decade. It is the purpose of this paper to attempt to delineate more clearly the degree and nature of minority participation on administrative levels in effective, policy-making positions, and to propose steps which can be taken to further the hiring of minorities for these positions.

Minorities in City and School District Populations

Where, then, after the prolonged struggle to achieve equal employment opportunity for minority educators, do school districts stand in 1974 with respect to the numbers of minority group members who have moved into policy-making positions? School board members are, by definition, the policy-makers, but are not, of course, paid, professional or full-time administrators. Policy-making positions in education may be defined as those in which the incumbent has the final responsibility for carrying out board of education policy and/or making final decisions on the method or process whereby such policy will be carried out. The latter decisions may, in fact, be policy decisions. Traditional policy-making positions include superintendent of schools; deputy, associate or assistant superintendent; and regional, area or district superintendent in a decentralized system. Such positions are funded by the regular operating budget of the school district, in contrast to those positions (see Section IV) which may or may not be at the policy-making level and which are funded by special funds from sources outside the school district.

In an attempt to find out how well integrated the educational hierarchy has become, a survey was undertaken of 48 school districts which varied both in size and in relative proportion of white and minority population.

School districts in these cities were sent a short and straightforward questionnaire (with space to include additional explanatory data) which asked them to report on the percentage of minority group members in their student populations, the titles and numbers of minority administrators, and whether these were positions funded by the school district operating budget or by special funds. It was difficult to gather these kinds of data. Responses to such inquiries ranged from full co-operation to outright refusal to provide information because of either the time and effort it would require of already overburdened personnel or the fact that personnel

records did not include racial and ethnic designations. In some cases, there was no response at all. Only through personal contacts with such sources as school board members, top-level administrators, research directors and others was the necessary information obtained.

Table I gives a list of the 48 cities in alphabetical order, with a numerical breakdown of their general and school populations. Also shown are the percentages of minorities in the general and school population, and the percentage difference between these two.

The results of the questionnaire demonstrated the striking differences between the minority proportion of the general population and the minority proportion of the public school population. Two southern cities, for example, have populations almost equally divided between white and minority: Atlanta has a 54.3% minority population, and New Orleans 49.4%. Yet, their public school students are 82.5% and 77% minority, respectively, a difference of almost 30%. Northern cities, whether large or small, display the same disparities. In Chicago, second largest city in the country, minority groups comprise 40% of the population, yet the schools are over 69% minority. A relatively small city, Hartford, Connecticut (population: 158,000), is 35% minority; its schools have more than twice that proportion of minority students (72%). Of the 48 cities surveyed, one-half had school populations ranging from 60% to nearly 100% minority. In every instance, the student population displayed a greater proportion of minority group members than did the population of the city as a whole. Several factors account for this: a separate parochial (Roman Catholic) school system which is often preponderantly white; other private independent schools; and the tendency of young, white families to move to suburban areas while black families, with school age children, remain within the city limits.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table I
City and Student Populations with Minority Percentages of Each[1]

City	Total Population	% Min.	Public School Student Population	% Min.	Col. 5 Minus Col. 3
Atlanta, Ga.	496,973	54.3	90,000	82.5	28.2
Baltimore, Md.	905,759	47.3	182,911	70.4	23.1
Berkeley, Cal.	116,716	27.6	14,000	74.0	46.4
Birmingham, Ala.	300,910	42.4	54,841	62.0	19.6
Boston, Mass.	641,071	19.1	95,000	38.0	18.9
Bremen, Ill.	94,133	14.2	6,742	20.1	13.4
Chicago, Ill.	5,366,957	40.0	554,971	69.3	29.3
Cincinnati, O.	452,524	28.2	73,107	49.1	21.9
Columbus, O.	539,677	19.1	101,622	30.6	11.5
Compton, Cal.	78,611	83.6	38,000	90.0	6.4
Daly City, Cal.	66,922	19.8	7,928	21.9	2.1
Dayton, O.	243,601	31.3	47,683	45.0	13.7
Detroit, Mich.	1,511,482	45.5	265,578	71.5	26.0
D. of Columbia	756,510	74.0	137,000	97.0	23.0
E. Orange, N.J.	75,471	55.1	11,870	95.5	40.4
E. Palo Alto, Cal.	18,727	57.9	4,200	90.0	31.1
El Paso, Tex.	322,261	59.5	62,000	64.0	4.5
Evanston, Ill.	79,808	17.9	4,800	24.0	6.1
Gary, Ind.	175,415	60.9	43,312	79.9	19.0
Harrisburg, Pa.	68,061	31.7	10,400	65.4	33.7
Hartford, Conn.	158,017	35.4	28,000	72.0	37.6
Hempstead, N.Y.	39,411	39.2	5,700	90.0	50.8
Jacksonville, Fla.	528,865	23.3	112,000	30.0	6.7

[1] Based on U.S. Census, 1970.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

City	Total Population	% Min.	Public School Student Population	% Min.	Col. 5 Minus Col. 3
Los Angeles, Cal.	2,816,061	35.0	607,107	50.9	15.9
Mahwah, N.J.	10,539	2.6	2,600	10.0	7.4
Memphis, Tenn.	623,530	39.3	127,000	68.0	28.7
Miami, Fla.	1,267,792	38.6	244,354	53.8	15.2
Milwaukee, Wis.	717,099	16.9	122,484	34.8	17.9
Minneapolis, Minn.	434,400	5.3	58,833	12.7	7.4
Montclair, N.J.	44,043	28.6	7,157	40.0	11.4
Newark, Del.	20,757	4.3	16,477	40.0	.3
Newark, N.J.	382,417	66.2	75,000	88.0	21.8
New Orleans, La.	593,471	49.4	99,543	77.2	27.6
New Rochelle, N.Y.	75,385	17.1	12,000	25.0	7.9
New York, N.Y.	7,894,862	36.8	1,128,996	63.0	26.2
Oakland, Cal.	361,561	42.1	56,911	71.9	29.8
Palo Alto, Cal.	55,966	6.9	13,342	8.0	1.1
Philadelphia, Pa.	1,948,609	35.9	267,918	65.9	30.0
Phoenix, Ariz.	581,562	17.5	28,938	25.7	8.2
Portland, Ore.	382,619	7.3	66,325	13.0	5.7
Sacramento, Cal.	254,413	21.7	47,426	30.6	8.9
St. Louis, Mo.	622,236	41.8	97,500	70.0	28.2
San Antonio, Tex.	654,153	59.0	72,000	80.0	21.0
San Diego, Cal.	696,769	18.3	122,0??	25.4	7.1
San Francisco, Cal.	715,674	25.0	78,023	44.8	19.8
Trenton, N.J.	104,638	41.5	17,240	79.0	37.5

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

City	Total Population	% Min.	Public School Student Population	% Min.	Col. 5 Minus Col. 3
Tulsa, Okla.	331,638	11.4	67,841	17.1	5.7
Wilmington, Del.	80,386	45.8	15,000	88.0	42.2

For purposes of further analysis, the cities were first grouped according to the percentage of minorities in the general population – 0-20%, 20-40%, and so on (see Table II). A second grouping of the cities, using the same percentage categories, was then made according to the percentage of minority group members in the school district population (see Table III).

When the cities surveyed were regrouped according to the percentage of minority group members in their public school populations, a general shift toward a category of higher minority percentage took place. A comparison of Tables II and III indicates this trend. Of the 15 cities in Group I (0-20% minority population) in terms of the general population, only 7 remain in Group I when the student population is considered. Of the 17 cities in Group II (Table II), 3 remained in Group II (Table III), 6 moved to Group III (Table III), 7 moved to Group IV (Table III), and 1 moved to Group V (Table III). Of the 11 cities in Group III (Table II), none remained in Group III (Table III), 9 moved to Group IV (Table III) and 2 moved to Group V (Table III). The four cities in Group IV (Table II) all moved to Group V (Table III).

Clearly, the school district populations of not only the largest cities (Los Angeles, New York, Chicago, Philadelphia), but many others as well, are at least 50% minority. What do these

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

facts imply (or *should* they imply) for the composition of the teaching, administrative and policy-making staff of the school districts?

Table II
Grouping of Cities According to Minority* Population of Cities

Group I (0-20% minority) (15 cities)		
Boston	Mahwah	Palo Alto
Bremen	Milwaukee	Phoenix
Columbus	Minneapolis	Portland
Daly City	Newark, Del.	San Diego
Evanston	New Rochelle	Tulsa

Group II (20-40% minority) (17 cities)		
Berkeley	Hempstead	New York
Chicago	Jacksonville	Philadelphia
Cincinnati	Los Angeles	Sacramento
Dayton	Memphis	San Antonio
Harrisburg	Miami	San Francisco
Hartford	Montclair	

*Includes Spanish-speaking and black.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Group III (40-60% minority) (11 cities)		
Atlanta	East Orange	Trenton
Baltimore	El Paso	Wilmington
Birmingham	Oakland	New Orleans
Detroit		

Group IV (60-80% minority) (4 cities)		
District of Columbia	Newark, N.J.	E. Palo Alto
Gary		

Group V (80-100% minority)		
Compton		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table III
Grouping of Cities According to Minority* Population of Students in School District.

Group I (0-20% minority) (7 cities)		
Bremen	Newark, Del.	Portland
Mahwah	Palo Alto	Tulsa
Minneapolis		

Group II (20-40% minority) (11 cities)		
Boston	Jacksonville	Phoenix
Columbus	Milwaukee	Sacramento
Daly City	Montclair	San Diego
Evanston	New Rochelle	

Group III (40-60% minority) (6 cities)		
Chicago	Dayton	Miami
Cincinnati	Los Angeles	San Francisco

*Includes Spanish-speaking, and black

Minority Educators in Policy-Making Positions, 1974

The goal of this study is, of course, to determine how many minority group educators have moved into policy-making positions. Implicit in this is the question of whether the number of minority policy-makers is in any way proportionate to the number of minority group members in the general population.

Such agencies as the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, for instance, suggest that target goals for hiring or promotion be made on the basis of the proportion of minorities in the population in the area in which one reasonably expects to recruit. For superintendents the recruitment area might be nationwide, but for others it would, in most cases, be local.

As was demonstrated in the preceding discussion, however, there are in most cases great disparities between the minority percentage of the city populations and the minority percentage of the student population. Obviously, an employment goal of minority group members based on the proportion of that group in the city population would be considerably smaller than a goal based on its proportion of the school district students.

It is the position of the Recruitment LTI that in analyzing minority representation in high-ranking school district positions, as well as in recommending equitable target numbers to be reached, the basis of comparison should be minority percentages in the student population. The "clientele" of a school district consists of the students enrolled therein; the fact that there are other students residing within that district, who are eligible to attend the public schools but do not do so, is irrelevant. The policies and practices of the school district affect most seriously the students actually attending the public schools, and they, as the ones who will suffer or benefit to the degree that their interests are taken into account,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Group IV (60-80% minority) (16 cities)		
Atlanta	Harrisburg	Oakland
Baltimore	Hartford	Philadelphia
Berkeley	Memphis	St. Louis
Birmingham	New Orleans	San Antonio
Detroit	New York	Trenton
El Paso		

Group V (80-100% minority) (8 cities)		
Compton	E. Palo Alto	Newark, N.J.
District of Columbia	Gary	Wilmington
East Orange	Hempstead	

should be represented proportionately among school district policy-makers.

Therefore, in the following tables containing data on minorities in policy-making positions and in the succeeding analyses, cities are grouped according to the percentage of minority group students in the public school populations.

The seven districts in Table IV, representing seven states, have several things in common. They have small percentages of blacks, Spanish-speaking Americans and other minorities. Tulsa, Oklahoma, alone among the seven districts has a significant minority population consisting of native Americans, blacks and Spanish-speaking minorities. It is encouraging to note that four of the seven school districts have minority representation on their school boards. One (Minneapolis, Minnesota) has minority representation in three policy-making areas, all of which are supported by operating budget allocations.

The eleven districts in Table V, representing nine states, have significant minority populations. Six have minority representation on their school boards and six have members of minority groups in policy-making positions. A rather interesting situation exists in Sacramento, California: a black superintendent of schools is in a district which has a 17% black student population and combined minority population of 31%. Policy-making positions include not only black but other minorities as well.

The six districts in Table VI represent four states. With only one exception, they have minority student populations which constitute more than half of all students enrolled in their public school systems. Only Columbus, Ohio, has a majority of white students in its public schools. All the school boards

KEY: W = White
Bl. = Black
O.M. = Other Minority
S.S. = Spanish Surname

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table IV
Group I School Districts -- 0-20% Minority Student Population

City	No. of Students	% Black	% Span. Surname	School Board			Supt. of Schools	Deputy Supt.		Assoc. Supt.		Asst. Supt.		Regional or Dist. Supt.		Directors			
				Total	Black	Other Minority										Operating Budget		Federal or Found. Budget	
								Bl.	O.M.	Bl.	O.M.	Bl.	O.M.	Bl.	O.M.	Bl.	O.M.	Bl.	O.M.
Bremen, Ill.	6,742	0.8	0.1	7	-	0	W	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mahwah, N.J.	2,600	10.0	-	9	0	0	W	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Minneap., Minn.	58,833	11.7	1.0	7	1	0	W	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	-
Newark, Del.	16,477	3.0	1.0	5	0	0	W	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Palo Alto, Cal.	13,342	5.0	3.0	5	0	0	W	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Portland, Ore.	66,325	11.4	1.6	7	1	0	W	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-
Tulsa, Okla.	67,841	16.1	5.0	7	2	0	W	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-

KEY: W = White
Bl. = Black
O.M. = Other Minority
S.S. = Spanish Surname

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table V
Group II School Districts – 20-40% Minority Student Population

City	No. of Students	% Black	% Span. Sur-Name	School Board			Supt. of Schools	Deputy Supt		Assoc. Supt.		Asst. Supt.		Regional Dist. Supt.		Directors			
				Total	Black	Other Minority										Operating Budget		Federal or Found. Budget	
								Bl.	O.M.	Bl.	O.M.	Bl.	O.M.	Bl.	O.M.	Bl.	O.M.	Bl.	O.M.
Boston, Mass.	95,000	38.0	-	5	0	0	W	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
Columbus, O.	101,622	30.6	-	7	3	0	W	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-
Daly City, Cal.	7,928	8.9	13.0	5	0	0	W	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Evanston, Ill.	4,800	20.0	4.0	7	2	0	W	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	-
Jacksonville, Fla.	112,000	30.0	-	-	-	-	W	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Milwaukee, Wis.	112,484	31.2	3.6	15	0	0	W	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Montclair, N.J.	7,157	39.5	0.5	7	1	0	W	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
New Rochelle, N.Y.	12,000	20.0	5.0	9	2	0	W	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-
Phoenix, Ariz.	28,938	9.4	16.3	5	0	0	W	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sacramento, Cal.	47,426	17.7	12.9	7	1	2	Bl.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	1
San Diego, Cal.	122,031	13.7	11.7	5	1	0	W	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	2

KEY: W = White
Bl. = Black
O.M. = Other Minority
S.S. = Spanish Surname

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table VI
Group III School Districts — 40-60% Minority Student Population

City	No. of Students	% Black	% Span. Surname	School Board			Supt. of Schools	Deputy Supt.		Assoc. Supt.		Asst. Supt.		Regional or Dist. Supt.		Directors			
				Total	Black	Other Minority										Operating Budget		Federal or Found. Budget	
								Bl.	O.M.	Bl.	O.M.	Bl.	O.M.	Bl.	O.M.	Bl.	O.M.	Bl.	O.M.
Chicago, Ill.	554,971	57.6	11.7	11	3	1	W	1	-	1	-	3	-	9	-	19	4	4	2
Cincinnati, O.	73,107	48.9	1.2	7	2	0	W	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
Dayton, O.	47,683	45.0	25.6	7	1	0	W	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	3	-	-	-
Los Angeles, Cal.	607,107	25.3	25.6	7	0	1	W	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	3	3	-	2
Miami, Fla.	244,354	26.6	27.2	7	1	1	W	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	2	1	-	-
San Fran., Cal.	78,023	30.5	14.3	7	1	1	W	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	3	2	-	-

Table VII
Group IV School Districts – 60-80% Minority Student Population

City	No. of Students	% Black	% Span. Surname	School Board			Supt. of Schools	Deputy Supt.		Assoc. Supt.		Asst. Supt.		Regional or Dist. Supt.		Directors			
				Total	Black	Other Minority										Operating Budget		Federal or Found. Budget	
								Bl.	O.M.	Bl.	O.M.	Bl.	O.M.	Bl.	O.M.	Bl.	O.M.	Bl.	O.M.
Atlanta, Ga.	90,000	81.5	1.0	9	5	0	Bl.	–	–	1	–	4	–	3	–	4	–	1	–
Baltimore, Md.	182,911	70.4	–	9	4	0	Bl.	2	–	–	–	4	–	6	–	3	–	–	–
Berkeley, Cal.	14,000	70.0	4.0	5	2	1	Bl.	–	–	–	–	2	–	–	–	4	2	11	2
Birmingham, Ala.	54,841	62.0	–	5	2	0	W	–	–	–	–	1	–	–	–	1	–	1	–
Detroit, Mich.	265,578	69.8	1.7	13	9	0	W	1	–	–	–	3	–	5	–	3	–	2	–
El Paso, Tex.	62,000	8.0	56.0	7	0	2	W	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	–	1	–	–
Harrisburg, Pa.	10,400	63.5	1.9	9	0	0	Bl.	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Hartford, Conn.	28,000	48.0	24.0	9	1	1	W	–	–	–	–	1	–	–	–	2	1	–	–
Memphis, Tenn	127,000	68.0	–	9	3	0	W	–	–	–	–	1	–	2	–	2	–	–	–
New Orleans, La.	99,543	77.0	1.0	5	1	–	W	–	–	1	–	2	–	–	–	3	–	3	–
New York, N.Y.	1,128,996	36.1	26.9	279	61	38	W	1	1	1	–	3	–	6	3	8	–	–	–
Oakland, Cal.	56,911	64.2	7.7	7	2	0	W	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	–	–	–	1	–
Phila. Pa.	267,918	62.0	3.9	9	3	0	W	1	–	2	–	–	–	3	–	15	–	–	–
St. Louis, Mo.	97,500	70.0	–	12	4	0	W	1	–	–	–	–	–	3	–	4	–	4	–
San Antonio, Tex.	72,000	16.0	64.0	7	1	3	W	1	1	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	1
Trenton, N.J.	17,240	70.0	9.0	9	3	0	S.S.			–	–	–	–	–	–	3	–	4	–

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

KEY: W = White
Bl. = Black
O.M. = Other Minority
S.S. = Spanish Surname

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table VIII
Group V School Districts - 80-100% Minority Student Population

City	No. of Students	% Black	% Span. Sur-	School Board			Supt. of Schools	Deputy Supt.		Assoc. Supt.		Asst. Supt.		Regional or Dist. Supt.		Directors			
				Total	Black	Other Minority										Operating Budget		Federal or Found. Budget	
								Bl.	O.M.	Bl.	O.M.	Bl.	O.M.	Bl.	O.M.	Bl.	O.M.	Bl.	O.M.
Compton, Cal.	38,000	80.0	10.0	6	1	1	W	-	-	-	-	2	-	2	-	1	1	2	1
District of Col.	137,000	96.0	1.0	11	7	0	Bl.	2	-	2	-	2	-	-	-	6	-	-	-
E. Orange, N.J.	11,870	94.0	1.5	7	5	0	Bl.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	1	-
E. Palo Alto, Cal.	4,200	86.0	4.0	5	5	0	Bl.	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
Gary, Ind.	43,312	72.3	7.6	5	3	1	W	-	-	-	-	1	-	2	-	1	-	2	-
Hempstead, N.Y.	5,700	86.0	4.0	5	4	0	W	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
Newark, N.J.	75,000	72.0	16.0	9	4	1	Bl.	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	1	-	1	-
Wilmington, Del.	15,000	83.0	5.0	7	4	0	Bl.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	2	-

have minority representation and each system has minority members in policy-making positions.

The sixteen school districts in Table VII, represent twelve states. Fifteen of the districts have minority representation on their school boards; five have minority groups in policy-making positions. Interestingly, in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, where a complete desegregation plan has been implemented, there is a black superintendent but no minority school board members.

Four of the sixteen superintendents in Table VII school districts are black and one is a Mexican-American. Three of the black superintendents have assumed their positions within the past twelve months. One obvious inference from the data is that the higher the percentage of minority students, the greater the probability that minority members will hold policy-making positions in the district, including the top position of superintendent. It is also likely that minorities will be represented on the school board, although it is unlikely that minority school board members will constitute a majority of the board. It is also reasonable to infer that even when specific school systems have an overwhelming majority of minority students, the superintendent is not likely to be a member of a minority group.

A special note of explanation is necessary on New York City. The totals included in these data include the decentralized districts with elected school boards. Approximately 50% of all Federally and foundation-funded positions in the New York City Public Schools are held by members of minority groups, including policy-making positions.

The eight school districts in Table VIII, represent six states and the District of Columbia. In these districts, white students are a decided minority. Five of the eight districts have

black superintendents, one a black woman. With the exception of East Palo Alto, California, the black superintendents have been in their positions two years or less. All the systems have minority representation. Seven of the eight districts have school boards where members of minority groups constitute a majority of the board of education.

In summary, it appears that the greater the percentage of minority students, the greater the probability that minorities will hold policy-making positions, including the position of superintendent of schools. The same may be said for school board representation: the larger the percentage of minority students, the greater the probability that school boards will have members of minority groups on the board. It is equally apparent, however, that unless the student population is almost totally minority the school board will not have a majority of members of minority groups. Baltimore, Birmingham, El Paso, Harrisburg, Hartford, Memphis, New Orleans, Oakland, Philadelphia, St. Louis, Trenton and Compton are illustrative of this phenomenon. But this phenomenon is closely allied with two variables: the percentage of minorities in the general population as contrasted with the school population; and the political balance of power in the city. To illustrate, whites constitute a majority of the general population in Birmingham, Harrisburg, Hartford, Memphis, New Orleans, New York, Oakland, Philadelphia, St. Louis, Trenton, Hempstead and Jacksonville. All have school boards with a majority of non-minority members. The District of Columbia, East Orange, Gary, Newark, Detroit, Atlanta, Berkeley all have black mayors. All have school boards where minorities constitute a majority of the board. But even more significantly, the balance of political power has shifted either in favor of minorities or to a more equalitarian basis.

It is also worth noting that members of the majority group can assume the top position in districts with overwhelmingly

minority student populations. One rarely sees the reverse: a member of a minority group assuming the top position in a school district where the student population is overwhelmingly representative of the majority group.

Traditional and Minority-Related Policy-Making Positions

Policy-making positions in public school education have been defined by the LTI as those in which the administrator carries out board of education policy and/or makes final decisions on the method or process by which those policies will be carried out. There are, of course, many other positions in the school district hierarchy which are administrative in nature but in which responsibility is limited to initiating and implementing particular programs under the authority and supervision of an administrator at a higher level.

In the 1960's many minority educators were appointed to these kinds of administrative positions because of public and student demands for curriculum reform. Increased community participation or school integration forced school districts to turn to their minority personnel for leadership. Spanish-speaking teachers, for instance, were suddenly in demand to institute and run bi-lingual programs. Black history and culture courses or urban studies required specialized knowledge and experience which few whites were prepared to offer. Many positions created to deal with intergroup relations or community affairs had to be staffed, at least in part, by minority group members. Even non-professional parents and others from low-income and minority communities were recruited and trained for work as classroom aides, home-school coordinators or advisory board members. For some, at least, these jobs, and new college-level training programs, represented their first opportunity to climb the educational career ladder.

Welcome as these new opportunities were, there were drawbacks. Such special programs were frequently established with Federal or private foundation funding and were, therefore, subject to curtailment or elimination when funds dried up. Moreover, in part because they were on "soft money", administrators of these programs rarely, if ever, became part of the policy-making structure at school district headquarters.

In enumerating minorities in educational administration, a distinction must be made between those who hold what might be termed "traditional" policy-making positions – superintendent, associate superintendent, district superintendent, etc. – and those who head the kinds of programs just described.

The latter positions (e.g., directors or coordinators of community affairs, intergroup relations, Afro-American studies, Title I programs, etc.) may be funded by either operating or outside funds. It would be inaccurate to conclude that *none* of the positions supported by outside funds may be regarded as being at a policy-making level. However, positions of long-range value and importance to the school district are generally placed in the operation budget, and occupants of these may be said to have become part of the policy-making structure.

The survey questionnaire requested school districts to list the titles of their minority-group administrators (if any) and to note which positions were funded by the operating budget and which by funds from outside sources. Again, using the categories of cities according to the proportion of minorities in student populations (as displayed in Table III), Table IX indicates how many minority administrators each group of school districts employs, the source of funds for their salaries, and which type of positions they had – "traditional" policy-making positions or administration of "special", i.e., minority-related, programs. Also given are the percentages of the total number of positions held by minority educators which are found in each type of position. Thus, the six Group III school districts (40%-60% minority students) employ a total of 82 minority-group administrators. Of these 82, 81.7% are in "traditional" policy-making positions (75.6% funded by the operating budgets, 6.1% by outside funds). The remaining 18.3% of the 82 administrators are in "minority-related"

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table IX
Distribution between Traditional and Minority-Related[1] Positions

School Districts	Operating Budget				Federal and Foundation Funded				Totals				
	Traditional		Minority		Traditional		Minority		Traditional		Minority		Total
	No.	Percent[2]	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	
Group I	3	37.5	2	25.0	1	12.5	2	25.0	4	50.0	4	50.0	8
Group II	19	79.2	1	4.1	3	12.5	1	4.1	22	91.7	2	8.2	24
Group III	62	75.6	12	14.6	5	6.1	3	3.7	67	81.7	15	18.3	82
Group IV	124	79.0	3	1.9	26[3]	16.6	4	2.5	150[3]	95.6	7	4.4	157
Group V	40	81.6	0	-	7	14.3	2	4.1	47	95.9	2	4.1	49
Totals	248	-	28	-	42	-	12	-	290	-	30	-	320

[1] This category includes positions dealing with bi-lingual studies, Community Relations, Model Cities, Title I, Human Relations, Title VII, Race Relations, Equal Educational Opportunity, etc.

[2] Percent of total number of minorities in policy positions within the city category.

[3] Not counted: 50% of the directors of Federally and foundation-funded programs in New York are minority. No number count supplied.

positions (14.6% funded by the operating budgets and 3.7% by outside funds).

Members of minority groups appear in greater number in traditional line and staff policy-making positions. The greater the number and percentage of minority students in the district, the greater the probability that minorities will occupy traditional policy-making positions funded under operating budget allocations.

Tables X and XI show how long the minority incumbents of "traditional" and "minority-related" positions have held these positions.

Most members of minority groups have been in their positions for a relatively short period of time. For superintendents, this probably represents the fairly rapid turnover of urban school superintendencies, the expansion of job opportunities for minorities and often the unattractiveness of certain superintendencies to members of the majority group. For other positions, the short tenure is probably representative of community and student pressure for equal opportunity, affirmative action programs (voluntary or imposed by government agencies) and the fruits of the civil rights movement of the 1960's. Perhaps of equal importance is the shift in the balance of political power in a number of urban areas.

As Table XI indicates, almost all of the minority-related positions are of recent duration. The number of such positions appears to be declining as members of minority groups have opportunities to move into other positions. The decline may also represent the elimination of such jobs and the return of previous incumbents to lower-level teaching jobs. Most of these positions were created in the middle and late 1960's when school districts were seeking visible representation of minorities in central administration.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table X
Traditional Policy Positions Held by Minorities[1] – Length of Time in Current Positions

School District	0-3 yrs.	3-6 yrs.	6-9 yrs.	9-12 yrs.	over 12 yrs.	Total
Group I	4	-	-	-	-	4
Group II	10	7	2	2	1	22
Group III	33	27	3	(4)		67
Group IV	96	23	4	(26)		149
Group V	32	11	4	-		47
Total	175	68	13	32	1	289
				(30 no yrs. given)		

Table XI
Minority-Related Policy Positions – Length of Time in Current Positions

School Districts	0-3 yrs.	3-6 yrs.	6-9 yrs.	9-12 yrs.	over 12 yrs.	Total
Group I	3	1	-	-	-	4
Group II	1	1	-	-	-	2
Group III	9	4	-	-	2	15
Group IV	5	2	1	-	-	8
Group V	1	1	-	-	-	2
Total	19	9	1		2	31

[1] Includes Federally and foundation-funded positions

In the school districts included in this report, most of the minority-related positions were created and staffed during the past six years and most members of minority groups are concentrated in minority-related positions or non-traditional staff positions. Members of minority groups who hold major policy-making positions have been in their positions no more than six years. More than 70% have held their positions three years or less.

A Note on Higher Education

One of the reasons sometimes offered for the low incidence of blacks and other minorities in policy-making positions in public school systems is that many of the highly qualified minorities have left public schools to enter college and university administration or teaching. When open admissions and other programs for the poor and for minorities were initiated by colleges and universities, public school systems were "raided," so the argument goes, and many blacks entered higher education.

Professors William Moore, Jr. and Lonnie Wagstaff of Ohio State University refute this argument and contend that no significant progress is being made in bringing blacks into college positions commensurate with their training.[10] Their data on this subject are the most exhaustive currently available.

A detailed questionnaire was mailed to black faculty and administrators in predominately white colleges throughout the United States. There were 3,228 responses to the questionnaire. Of this number, 1,054 were from persons in two-year community or junior colleges and 2,174 were from persons in four-year colleges and universities. Each person holding an administrative position was asked to identify his position by title and to describe some of the specific aspects of the position. No distinction was made between full-time or part-time administrative positions. The administrative positions listed in their data, therefore, included full-time (vice president, dean, etc.) and part-time positions (department chairman, etc.).

One of the interesting findings of the Moore-Wagstaff research was that 31.4% of the respondents in two-year institutions and 38.6% of those in four-year institutions held administrative positions. These data take on added significance when one notes that tenure in colleges and universities is usually

awarded on the basis of faculty status, not administrative position. A profile of the administrative positions is included in Tables XII and XIII.

Moore and Wagstaff also asked administrators to respond to two questions: How did you get your administrative position? How was your administrative position created?

More than half of the respondents in both two- and four-year institutions stated that they were recruited specifically for the position or promoted because of militant student demands. More than half of the respondents in two-year institutions and 60% in four-year institutions said institutional reorganization, governmental pressure for affirmative action and militant student demands created their positions.

Blacks seem to be concentrated in lower policy-making positions. The "assistant to" phenomenon is also observable with most blacks holding positions as coordinators, assistants or assistants to a major decision-maker. In many ways institutions of higher education are quite similar to public school systems in their employment and promotional policies for minorities.

Table XII
Administrative Positions Held by Blacks: Two-Year Institutions

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Position	Male Incumbent	Female Incumbent	Total
President	5	0	5
Vice President	2	0	2
Vice Provost	2	0	2
Dean	21	5	26
Associate Dean	9	3	12
Assistant Dean	6	3	9
Chairman	14	8	22
Vice Chairman	15	5	20
Assistant to President	6	2	8
Assistant to Dean	24	3	27
Director	66	22	88
Assistant Director	3	1	4
Coordinator	39	23	62
Assistant Coordinator	2	0	2
Assistant to Director	12	7	19
Assistant to Coordinator	14	4	18
Total	240	86	326
Other			5
			331

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table XIII
Administrative Positions Held by Blacks: Four-Year Institutions

Positions	Male Incumbent	Female Incumbent	Total
President	3	1	4
Vice President	17	0	17
Provost	5	0	5
Vice Provost	9	0	9
Dean	37	4	41
Associate Dean	25	6	31
Assistant Dean	61	22	83
Chairman	49	14	63
Vice Chairman	1	1	2
Assistant to President	9	2	11
Assistant to Vice President	19	0	19
Assistant to Dean	15	8	23
Director	223	60	283
Assistant Director	91	31	122
Coordinator	66	32	98
Assistant Coordinator	3	1	4
Assistant to Director	11	7	18
Assistant to Coordinator	2	1	3
Total	646	190	836
Other			4
			840

Conclusions and Recommendations

The survey of 48 school districts provides grounds for some cautious optimism while revealing that much remains to be done. Apparently the situation has changed since the 1970 survey (mentioned on page 11) in which 86% of the superintendents reported no black administrators. With few exceptions – and these mainly in districts with the lowest percentage of minorities in their populations – school systems throughout the country now do employ at least token numbers of minority administrators. But even in those systems in which minority-group students have actually become the majority of the school district population, the number of minority administrators is far below what it could and should be.

If the conditions of minorities are to change in this country, many more minority educational administrators must be included in the decision-making process regarding matters that relate to minority students. The influence, prestige and power of minority administrators must be increased so that they may become participants in the decision-making process, not objects of it.

Increases in numbers of minority administrators are necessary and possible. *Necessary* because minorities have been deprived of access to influential positions and to control of their own destiny. They have been denied positions which would have allowed them to help determine the course of their lives and the lives of their students and to serve as role models for young people in minority communities. *Possible* because there are available in the schools of this nation minority men and women who are qualified for and capable of administering educational institutions from kindergarten through college.

Increases in the number of minorities in policy-making positions in public school systems are no longer merely desirable;

in terms of ethical imperative or political expediency, they are now required by law. A school system is required to develop and submit an affirmative action program designed to end discrimination and alter the composition of the work force if:

> (a) it is a subcontractor to the Federal government with a contract of $50,000 or more, (b) a state law or regulation requires the filing of affirmative action plans, or (c) the system has been ordered to file a plan as a corrective measure for federal agency findings of discrimination.[11]

However, voluntary development of an affirmative action plan is a progressive employment practice. Legal prohibition of racially and sexually discriminatory practices covers nearly every public education program, so it is to the advantage of the school system to identify all possible sources of discrimination before charges may be filed against it.

The Office of Federal Contract Compliance, in its Order No. 4, recommends that Affirmative Action Programs have the following elements:

> An Affirmative Action Program is a set of specific and result-oriented procedures to which a contractor commits himself to apply every good faith effort. The objective of those procedures plus such efforts is equal employment opportunity. Procedures without effort to make them work are meaningless; and effort undirected by specific and meaningful procedures, is inadequate. An acceptable affirmative action program must include an analysis of areas within which the contractor is deficient in the utilization of minority groups and women, and further, goals and timetables to which the contractor's good faith efforts must be directed to correct the deficiencies and, thus *to increase materially*

the utilization of minorities and women, to all levels and in all segments of his work force where deficiencies exist.[12]

We do not propose to consider here all the elements of an Affirmative Action Program. However, it must be clearly understood that any acceptable program would include increases in minorities holding those positions which have been referred to in this paper as policy-making positions. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission makes this quite clear in stating that:

> *If a statistical survey shows that minorities . . . are not participating in your work force at all levels in reasonable relation to their presence in the population and the labor force, the burden of proof is on you to show that this is not the result of discrimination,* however inadvertent. There is a strong possibility that some part of your system is discriminating . . . .[13]

The Commission suggests that employers set short- and long-range goals which attain a reasonable relationship between work force data and population and labor force figures within five years. The Commission is, in effect, stating that all employers must recruit, promote, train and transfer minorities to *all* positions so that they represent a proportion at each level equal to their numbers in the population. The Recruitment LTI has proposed in this paper that the basis for comparison of minority representation should be minority percentages in the student population, not the general population. In either event, for school systems in cities which currently have or in the next five years will have largely minority-group student and/or general populations the message is clear: *alter current personnel procedures and implement affirmative policies which will place large numbers of minorities into policy-making positions.* All other school

districts, regardless of the percentage of minority students or population, must also implement policies and procedures which will insure representative numbers of minority policy-makers.

The critical step, in a test of the system's commitment to equal employment opportunity, is the determination of policy and the establishment of specific goals, both short- and long-range. Once this has been done, the recruitment of qualified minority educators is possible despite the often-heard arguments that none is available. Although the pool from which to recruit prospective minority policy-makers is relatively small once the commitment has been made, those charged with hiring minority administrators will find many resources available to assist in carrying out their assignments.

There are no magic formulas which the Recruitment LTI, or any other source for that matter, can offer to solve the problem of underutilization of minorities in policy-making positions in public school districts. However, the LTI offers the following recommendations.

Survey Your Professional Staff

The first step is obviously that of getting the facts about the current employment picture in a given school district. Many school systems have already undertaken surveys of the racial, ethnic and female composition of their teaching staff and perhaps other groups of employees. The LTI suggests that it is at least as important to identify the number and proportion of positions at each level in the administrative hierarchy held by minority group members. A simple comparison with the proportions of various minorities in the city and in the student population will quickly reveal how representative the policy-making group is.

Many potential minority policy-makers, in fact, may already be employed in many school districts as teachers or principals.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table XIV
Percentages of Minority Full-Time Teachers

City	Bl.	S.S.	Ortl.	A.I.
Atlanta, Ga.	59.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
Baltimore, Md.	56.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
Berkeley, Cal.	24.1	2.7	4.8	0.1
Birmingham, Ala.	50.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
Boston, Mass.	5.1	0.7	0.1	0.0
Bremen, Ill.	-	-	-	-
Chicago, Ill.	34.2	0.6	0.6	0.0
Cincinnati, O.	23.4	0.0	0.1	0.0
Columbus, O.	11.6	0.1	0.1	0.1
Compton, Cal.	61.3	1.5	1.7	0.1
Daly City, Cal.	-	-	-	-
Dayton, O.	31.2	0.2	0.3	0.0
Detroit, Mich.	41.4	0.4	0.4	0.2
Dist. of Columbia	79.5	0.2	0.2	0.0
E. Orange, N.J.	31.1	0.3	0.5	0.0
E. Palo Alto, Cal.	-	-	-	-
El Paso, Tex.	3.1	19.9	0.5	0.2
Evanston, Ill.	14.3	0.2	0.6	0.2
Gary, Ind.	59.6	1.0	0.4	0.0
Harrisburg, Pa.	21.8	0.0	0.2	0.0
Hartford, Conn.	19.0	1.6	0.1	0.0
Hempstead, N.Y.	27.9	0.3	1.0	0.0
Jacksonville, Fla.	-	-	-	-
Los Angeles, Cal.	14.7	3.0	4.5	0.1
Mahwah, N.J.	2.1	0.7	0.7	0.0
Memphis, Tenn.	41.9	0.0	0.0	0.0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

City	Bl.	S.S.	Ortl.	A.I.
Miami, Fla.	21.2	4.1	0.1	0.0
Milwaukee, Wis.	13.0	0.4	0.4	0.2
Minneapolis, Minn.	4.7	0.3	0.5	0.3
Montclair, N.J.	15.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Newark, Del.	3.5	0.0	0.3	0.1
Newark, N.J.	35.8	1.5	0.3	0.1
New Orleans, La.	55.8	0.2	0.1	0.7
New Rochelle, N.Y.	9.9	0.5	0.3	0.0
New York, N.Y.	7.8	1.3	0.4	0.0
Oakland, Cal.	24.7	1.9	3.4	0.1
Palo Alto, Cal.	2.2	2.2	3.9	0.0
Philadelphia, Pa.	32.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
Phoenix, Ariz.	8.1	6.4	0.1	0.1
Portland, Oregon	3.5	0.2	1.3	0.1
Sacramento, Cal.	5.1	1.7	2.4	0.7
St. Louis, Mo.	53.4	0.2	0.3	0.0
San Antonio, Tex.	14.4	12.9	0.2	0.0
San Diego, Cal.	5.1	2.3	0.7	0.0
San Francisco, Cal.	9.0	2.8	6.8	0.0
Trenton, N.J.	28.7	0.4	0.2	0.0
Tulsa, Okla.	11.8	0.2	0.0	2.0
Wilmington, Del.	57.6	0.3	0.0	0.0

*Key Bl. = Black Ortl. = Oriental
S.S. = Spanish Surname A.I. = American Indian

Source: Director of Public Elementary and Secondary Schools in Selected Districts, Enrollment and Staff by Racial/Ethnic Group, Fall 1970. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare/Office for Civil Rights.

This contention is supported by figures in Table XIV of the percentage of minority teachers employed in the 48 school districts surveyed in this study.

The data indicate that in nearly half of the cities (21 of 44 cities on which data were available) minority full-time teachers represent in excess of 25% of the teaching staff. In nine cities the figures are above 50%, in three (Washington, D.C., Compton, California, and Gary, Indiana) they are above 60%.

There is no way of knowing how many of these minority teachers would qualify for or be interested in policy-making positions and unfortunately, figures are not available on minorities holding administrative (principal, vice principal, department head) positions. However, it would certainly behoove each school district to survey its minority staff members to ascertain their qualifications for promotional positions.

Contact Directors of Administrative Training Programs

The most direct way to identify prospective candidates outside of your system is through graduate schools which are training educational administrators. Administrative training programs in many colleges and universities have attracted and prepared minority educators to assume high-level positions with school districts. Key individuals to contact for prospective candidates would be the heads of departments of educational administration in your area and minority professors of educational administration. Black professors of educational administration whose names appear in Appendix A, can provide direct leads to recent minority graduates.

A number of administrative training programs have been funded by the U.S. Office of Education and the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations. Although these programs were not designed specifically for minorities, large numbers of black, Chicano, Oriental and American-Indian educators are current-

ly enrolled or have completed specialized internships or training leading to an advanced degree.

Four such programs are described below. For additional information on these programs or graduates contact the program directors.

Fellowships for Managers of Educational Change

This U.S. Office of Education funded program, designed to develop skills and competencies requisite to the management of educational and institutional change, involved full-time graduate study leading to an advanced degree in education.

A total of 464 fellowships have been awarded for study at 21 institutions which received grants under Part C of the Education Professions Development Act. Since 1970 minorities have represented 45% of those receiving fellowships; black (140), Chicano (26) and American-Indian (28).

The names of the institutions, the directors of the programs and the number of minority students from each are in Appendix B.

The Consortium for Educational Leadership

The Consortium is a non-profit corporation whose members include seven major institutions of higher education. Its purposes are to train educational leaders and to assist in the recruitment of qualified educators. Financial support for the initial work of the Consortium has been provided by a grant from the Ford Foundation. Despite district differences among the graduate programs of the seven institutions, a common definition of educational leadership is shared.

Since 1970, a total of 256 fellows have enrolled in the program at one of the seven participating institutions. Of these, 111 are black, 30 Chicano, and 2 Oriental. The names of the institutions, program directors, and numbers of minority students are in Appendix C.

Superintendents Training Program

The objective of this Rockefeller Foundation program is to prepare experienced administrators for high-level duties in the nation's school systems. Program fellows spend a year on site, working directly with a superintendent and his staff, receiving invaluable training and experience. Program consultants work directly with the fellows and superintendents, responding to individual needs and seeing to it that each experience leads toward increased responsibility and leadership.

Since its inception in 1970, the 29 administrators who have completed the program are now working around the country as school superintendents; deputy, associate or assistant superintendents; or as educational program directors; area, assistant, and regional superintendents.

All of the 29 fellows are minorities: 22 black (2 of whom are female); 7 Chicano; and 2 Oriental.

For further information on this program or any of its graduates contact:

Bruce Williams, Program Associate
The Rockefeller Foundation
111 West 50th Street
New York, New York 10020

National Program for Educational Leadership

This U.S. Office of Education funded program attempted to develop non-traditional candidates for educational leadership. The program recruited talented people both inside and outside the field of education (with emphasis on people in other fields and careers) and fashioned individualized programs for them. Two-year and 18-month fellowships were provided. Each of the participants served an internship in a local school system. The program is committed to providing new leadership talent, prepared in unconventional ways.

Support systems are being designed to assist graduates who are currently employed in state departments of education, the National Institute of Education and local school systems.

A total of 62 Fellowships have been awarded for study at 8 institutions which received grants under Part C of the Education Professions Development Act. Of these, 18 are black, 25 are Chicano and 9 American-Indian. The names of the institutions, program directors and numbers of minority graduates are in Appendix D.

Utilize Recruitment Sources

There are numerous intergroup agencies, employment agencies, minority organizations, newspapers, and recruitment services which can be of assistance in recruitment endeavors which extend beyond your own school staff and university training programs. The following list is a representative selection of possible recruitment sources.

Intergroup Agencies Employment Agencies and Minority Organizations

National Alliance of Black School Educators
Dr. Charles W. Townsel, President
P. O. Box 226D
Sacramento, California 95831

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People
200 E. 27th Street
New York, New York 10016

National Education Association
Teacher Rights Division
Samuel B. Ethridge
1201 16th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

National Skills Bank
Ms. Ruth Allan King, Placement Office
477 Madison Avenue, 12th Floor
New York, New York 10022

National Urban League
Mr. James Williams
55 East 52nd Street
New York, New York 10022

Jobs Clearing House
115 Chauncy Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02109

Richard Clarke Agency
1270 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10020

Association De Educadores Puertorriquenos
Care of Avilda Orta
2351 First Avenue
New York, New York 10035

Frente Unido De Educadores Puertorriquenos (FUEP)
610 West 142nd Street (Suite 3C)
New York, New York 10031
Felipe Ortiz, President

Association Professores Universitarios
Care of Dr. Eduardo Seda Vonilla
Hunter College
695 Park Avenue
New York, New York 10021

Association Educadores Bilingues
2153 Belmont Avenue
New York, New York 10451
Oscar Garcia, President

Sociedad De Maestros Bilingues En Relaciones
De La Comunidad
P. S. 33
281 9th Avenue
New York, New York 10001
Rene Hernandez, President

Aspira of America, Inc.
245 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York 10016
Luis Alverez, National Executive Director

National Task Force De La Raza
University of New Mexico
College of Education
Albuquerque, New Mesico 87131
Dr. Henry Casso, Executive Secretary

Office of Chicano Affairs
School of Education
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305
Dr. Alfredo Castaneda

Spanish-Speaking Group

For additional information on local and state organizations contact: Gilbert Chavez, Spanish Program Staff, U.S. Office of Educa-

tion, 400 Maryland Avenue,
S.W., Washington, D.C.
20202.

National Indian Education Association
3036 University Avenue, S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55414

Americans for Indian Opportunity
1816 Jefferson Place, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

American Indian Press Association
1346 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 206
Washington, D.C. 20036

Association for Asian Studies
1 Lane Hall
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104

Predominantly Black Fraternities and Sororities

Fraternities:

Alpha Phi Alpha
4432 S. Parkway
Chicago, Illinois 60653

Kappa Alpha Psi
2320 N. Broad Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19132

Omega Psi Phi
107 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20002

Phi Beta Sigma
1105 Prospect Place
Brooklyn, New York 11213

Sororities:

Alpha Kappa Alpha
5211 S. Greenwood Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60615

Delta Sigma Theta
1707 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20009

Sigma Gamma Rho
2515 Ethel Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46208

Zeta Phi Beta
1734 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20009

Black Newspapers:

Birmingham *Mirror*
Los Angeles *Sentinel*
Oakland California *Voice*
San Diego *Lighthouse*
San Francisco *Independent*
Washington *Afro-American*
Jacksonville Florida *Star-News*
Jacksonville Florida *Tattler*
Miami Florida *Times*
Tampa Florida *Sentinel-Bulletin*
Atlanta *Daily World*
Valdosta *Telegram*

Chicago *Courier*
Chicago *Daily Defender*
Chicago *Defender*
Chicago *News Crusader*
Gary *American*
Indianapolis *Recorder*
New Orleans *Louisiana Weekly*
Baltimore *Afro-American*
Springfield *Sun*
Detroit Michigan *Chronicle*
Detroit *Tribune*
Kansas City *Call*
Omaha *Star*
Newark New Jersey *Herald News*
Brooklyn New York *Recorder*
Buffalo *Criterion*
Buffalo *Empire Star*
New York *Amsterdam News*
Charlotte *Post*
Durham Carolina *Times*
Raleigh *Carolinian*
Wilmington *Journal*
Cleveland *Call* and *Post*
Oklahoma City *Black Dispatch*
Philadelphia *Independent*
Philadelphia *Tribune*
Pittsburgh *Courier*
Fort Worth *Mind*
Houston *Forward Times*
Norfolk *Journal & Guide*
Richmond *Afro-American*
Roanoke *Tribune*

Recruitment Services

Affirmative Action Register

The Affirmative Action Register is a new affirmative action recruitment service aimed at implementing effective equal opportunity recruitment. It provides nationwide free distribution of notices of professional and managerial positions to over 25,000 minority and female candidate sources. Employers seeking to reach such qualified candidates nationally may advertise in the Register. Persons interested in positions will communicate directly with employers. The only fees are advertising charges paid by the employer ($80 per column inch).

The Affirmative Action Register will be available at the following locations:

1. All universities, colleges, and medical schools across the nation, including their placement offices; reference libraries; and Equal Employment Offices.

2. Academic departments and college programs composed predominantly of minority students and faculty, including black Americans, Spanish-speaking Americans, native Americans, and Oriental Americans.

3. Federal, state, and local government units and community action agencies, fraternal groups, and religious organizations interested in placing qualified female and minority candidates.

4. Some minority-owned management consulting firms and referral groups.

5. Several thousand national professional and academic organizations which offer placement information to their

members, including those groups representing females and minorities.

Equal opportunity employers seeking professors, administrators, and medical personnel may send their ads to Affirmative Action Services, 10 S. Brentwood Boulevard, St. Louis, Missouri 63105.

Computerized Research and Placement Service (CORPS)

CORPS is a new, non-profit research and placement service sponsored by the University Council for Educational Administration with Ford Foundation support. Its computerized data bank, located at Purdue University, includes current degree candidates of doctoral and post-master's degree programs in educational administration in the United States and Canada. Special effort has been directed toward including women and minority group members so that affirmative action employers have ready access to qualified personnel.

Subscribers to CORPS will receive resumes of all individuals in the data bank who meet the specific qualifications called for each time a request for a search is made. Each resume includes information about where transcripts, recommendations and other relevant material can be obtained. Each subscriber is entitled to four search requests, directories of women and minority group members and special reports. Additional searches will be conducted at a nominal fee. The fee for school districts is $100.

For further information regarding CORPS, write to:

The University Council for Educational Administration
29 West Woodruff Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43210

The Recruitment Leadership and Training Institute realizes that the appointment of minority administrators to policy-

making positions in public education will not solve all the complex problems facing public schools in our nation. It will, however, constitute a major step toward truly equal employment opportunity, equality of status in educational administration for minorities and more relevant and responsive policy-making.

Footnotes

1. "The Elusive Black Educator," *School Management,* Vol. 13, No. 3 (March, 1969), pp. 54-60.
2. "The Negro in Administration," *Overview,* Vol. 2 (June, 1961), pp. 35-37.
3. Pottinger, Stanley, "Non-Discrimination in Elementary and Secondary School Staffing Practices," *Integrated Education,* Vol. 9, No. 3 (May-June, 1971), pp. 52-55.
4. "The Negro in Administration," *op. cit.* p. 36.
5. "The Elusive Black Educator," *op. cit,* p. 56.
6. Ubben, Gerald C. and Hughes, Larry W., "Preparation Programs for Top-Level Negro Public School Administrators – A New Perspective," *Journal of Negro Education.* Vol. 38, No. 2, (Spring, 1969), p. 172.
7. "The Elusive Black Educator," *op. cit,* pp. 54-95.
8. "Opinion Poll: No Widespread Search for Black Teachers, Officials," *Nations Schools.* Vol. 85, No. 5 (May, 1970), p. 45.
9. Figures taken from the National Education Association draft of a proposed "Program for Displaced Educators and Students," 1972.
10. *Black Educators in White Colleges.* (San Francisco: Josey Bass Publishers, 1973).
11. *What is Affirmative Action? Combating Discrimination in Employment,* The National Education Association. (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1973), p. 3.
12. *Affirmative Action and Equal Employment: A Guidebook for Employers,* Vol. 2, U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (Washington, D.C.), D-28.
13. *Affirmative Action and Equal Employment: A Guidebook for Employers,* Vol. 1, U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (Washington, D.C.), pp. 4-7.

Appendix A

Black Professors in
Departments of Educational
Administration

Dr. C. C. Baker
School of Education
Auburn University
Auburn, Alabama 36830

Dr. Harold Bishop
University of Alabama
P. O. Box Q
University, Alabama 35486

Dr. Mossie Richmond
Asst. Prof. of Ed. Adm.
Arkansas State University
State University, Arkansas
72467

Dr. Rodney Reed
Department of Education
University of California
Berkeley, California 94720

Dr. Emmell Beech
Fullerton School District
1401 West Valencia Drive
Fullerton, California 92633

Vera Pitts
Dept. of Sch. Admin.
& Super.
Cal. State University
25800 Hillary Street
Hayward, California 94542

Prof. George O. Roberts
Asst. Vice Chancellor –
Academic and Student Aff.
Univ. of California at Irvine
Irvine, California 92664

Dr. Raleigh Jackson
Dept. of School Adm. &
Superintendent
California State University –
L.A.
5151 State University Drive
Los Angeles, California
90032

Dr. Raymond D. Terrell
Dept. of Sch. Adm. &
Super.
California State Univ.–L.A.
5151 State University Drive
Los Angeles, California
90032

Dr. Charles Z. Wilson
Vice Chancellor
University of California
at L.A.
2127 Murphy Hall
Los Angeles, California
90024

Dr. Maurita Billups
School of Education
California State University
6000 J Street
Sacramento, California
95819

Dr. Willard E. Roberson
1358 Galleon Way, Apt. B
San Luis Obispo, California
93401

Dr. Barbara R. Hatton
School of Education –
Room 9
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305

Professor William Brazzeil
School of Education
University of Connecticut
Storrs, Connecticut 06268

Dr. Hugh Scott
School of Education
Howard University
Washington, D.C. 20001

Dr. Samuel Woodard
School of Education
Howard University
Washington, D.C. 20001

Dr. Benjamin R. McClain
Dept. of Admin. & Supervision
College of Education
Florida Atlantic University
Boca Raton, Florida 33432

Dr. T. Winston Cole
College of Education
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida 32601

Mr. James Mark Corbett, Jr.
College of Education
University of North Florida
P. O. Box 17074
Jacksonville, Florida 32216

Dr. Andrew A. Robinson
Associate Dean
College of Education
University of North Florida
7334 Richardson Road
Jacksonville, Florida 32209

Dr. Allen Fisher
Div. of Gen. Prof. Educ.
Florida International
University
Miami, Florida 33144

Professor Leonard Campbell
College of Education
University of South Florida
Tampa, Florida 33620

Professor Milton Hill
Visiting Professor
College of Education
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30602

Dr. Robert H. Hatch
School of Education
Atlanta University
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

Dr. Barbara Jackson
School of Education
Atlanta University
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

Dr. Ronald Kilpatrick
School of Education
Atlanta University
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

Dr. Melvin E. Moore, Jr.
Educational Administration
and Foundations
Department
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, Illinois 62901

Dr. Samuel C. Davis
Asst. Dean, College of
Education
Graham Hall
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, Illinois 60115

Dr. Arthur D. Smith
School of Education
Northwestern University
2003 Sheridan Road
Evanston, Illinois 60201

Dr. Patrick Jimerson
Krannert School of Indus-
trial Management
Purdue University
Lafayette, Indiana 47907

Dr. William Thomas
Director of Special
Academic Services
Purdue University
Lafayette, Indiana 47907

Mr. James A. Callier
Univ. of Southwestern
Louisiana
Director of Special Services
Lafayette, Louisiana 70501

Dr. Elaine C. Davis
The Johns Hopkins
University
3800 Menlo Drive
Baltimore, Maryland 21215

Dr. Andrew Goodrich
College of Education
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland
20740

Dr. M. Lucia James
Professor of Education
College of Education
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland
20740

Dr. Jodellano Statom
College of Education
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland
20740

Dr. Kenneth Washington
Associate Professor
995 N. Pleasant #25
Amherst, Massachusetts
01002

Dr. Walter Dean
Springfield College
Springfield, Massachusetts
01109

Dr. Jesse Parks
Springfield College
Springfield, Massachusetts
01109

Burnis Hall, Jr.
College of Education
Division of Educational
Leadership
Wayne State University
Detroit, Michigan 48202

Mark H. Smith, Jr.
441 Education Building
Wayne State University
Detroit, Michigan 48202

Dr. Lloyd Cofer
College of Education
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan
48823

Dr. Charles C. Warfield
Dept. of Educational
Leadership
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49001

Dr. Thomas L. Jackson
Dept. of Educational
Administration
University of Minnesota
Health Services Building
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

Dr. Fontaine C. Piper
R. R. #2
Greentop, Missouri 63546

Dr. Clyde K. Phillips, Jr.
Department of Education
Lincoln University
Jefferson City, Missouri
65101

Frank Brown
Faculty of Educational
Studies
SUNY at Buffalo
Buffalo, New York 14214

Dr. Isaiah Reid
2328 Long Road
Grand Island, New York
14072

Dr. Robert Bentley
Bank Street College of
Education
610 West 112th Street
New York, New York 10025

Dr. Jerome A. Contee
Fordham University
113 West 60th Street
New York, New York 10023

Charles B. Hayes
School of Education
New York University
4 Washington Place,
Room 275
New York, New York 10003

Dr. Gordon Mack
Bank Street College of
Education
610 West 112th Street
New York, New York 10025

Dr. Anne Smith, Director
Cary Teacher Leader
Program
Bank Street College of
Education
610 West 112th Street
New York, New York 10025

Dr. Nona Weeks
Bank Street College of
Education
610 West 112th Street
New York, New York 10025

Dr. Spencer A. Durante
College of Education
Dept. of Admin. Super &
Hi. Ed.
Appalachian State University
Boone, North Carolina
28608

Dr. Charles Orr
Education Department
North Carolina Central
University
Durham, North Carolina
27707

Mr. J. Neil Armstrong
Director of Summer School
A. & T. State University
Greensboro, North Carolina
27411

Dr. Charles Bailey
N.C.A. & T. University
Greensboro, North Carolina
27412

Dr. Samuel O. Jones
Coordinator Student Teaching
A. & T. State University
Greensboro, North Carolina 27411

Dr. S. J. Shaw
Dean, School of Education
A. & T. State University
Greensboro, North Carolina 27411

Mr. Clinton R. Downing, Director
Gen. Asst. Center
School of Education
East Carolina University
P. O. Box 2706
Greenville, North Carolina 27834

Dr. Calvert Smith
University of Cincinnati
930 Goss Road
Cincinnati, Ohio 45229

Herman L. Brown
College of Education
Wright State University
Dayton, Ohio 45431

Dr. Herman Brown
c/o Dept. of Educational Administration
University of Dayton
Dayton, Ohio 45469

Dr. Joseph J. Cobb
College of Education
Wright State University
Dayton, Ohio 45431

William Moore, Jr.
Educational Administration
College of Education
301 Ramseyer Hall
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Russell Spillman
Educational Administration
College of Education – 310 Ramseyer
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Lonnie H. Wagstaff
Educational Administration
College of Education – 315 Ramseyer
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Dr. Joseph C. Sommerville
University of Toledo
Toledo, Ohio 43608

John M. Brayer
Teacher Corps
Youngstown State University
Youngstown, Ohio 44503

Roland Barnes
School of Education
2822 Cathedral of Learning
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
15260

Dr. Curtis L. Walker
Cramp Building – Rm. 210
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
15260

David G. Carter
College of Education
Rackley Building
The Pennsylvania State
University
University Park,
Pennsylvania 16802

Dr. Oliver R. Lumpkin
Dept. of Elem. & Second.
Educ.
Clemson University
Clemson, South Carolina
29631

Dr. George Harris
College of Education
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, Tennessee 37916

Dr. Willie Herenton
Administrator
Memphis City Schools
Memphis, Tennessee 38111

Dr. Sammie Lucas
Asst. Prof. of Educational
Admin.
College of Education
Memphis State University
Memphis, Tennessee 38152

Dr. William Sweet, Principal
Riverview Junior High
School
Memphis City Schools
Memphis, Tennessee 38111

Dr. Cecil Wright
College of Education
The University of Texas
Austin, Texas 78712

Dr. William Joseph Marks, Sr.
East Texas State University
7428 San Jose
Dallas, Texas 75241

Dr. Carl McCloudy
East Texas State University
1208 Glen Park Drive
Dallas, Texas 75241

Dr. Roosevelt Washington, Jr.
School of Education
North Texas State University
Denton, Texas 76203

Professor Floyd Perry
College of Education
Texas Tech University
Box 4560
Lubbock, Texas 79409

Professor David Porter
College of Education
Texas Tech University
Box 4560
Lubbock, Texas 79409

Dr. Don E. Miller
University of Texas of the
Permian Basin
1417 Cimarron Street
Odessa, Texas 79761

Dr. W. W. Clem
Distinguished Prof. of Educ.
Prairie View A&M University
Prairie View, Texas 77445

Dr. Harry G. Hendricks
Prairie View A&M University
Prairie View, Texas 77445

Dr. Tillman V. Jackson
Head, School of Education
P. O. Box 2371
Prairie View, Texas 77445

Dr. I. D. Starling
School of Education
Prairie View A&M University
Prairie View, Texas 77445

Mr. C. A. Thomas, Registrar
Prairie View A&M University
Prairie View, Texas 77445

Dr. E. K. Waters
College of Education
University of Houston
Houston, Texas 77004

Dr. William Bright, II
228 Waterman Building
The University of Vermont
Burlington, Vermont 05401

Dr. Houston Conley
College of Education
V.P.I. & State University
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

Nathan H. Johnson
School of Education
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Virginia
22903

Dr. Arthur J. Evans
Box 77
Virginia State College
Petersburg, Virginia 23803

Dr. Annette T. Goins
Box 79
Virginia State College
Petersburg, Virginia 23803

Dr. Albert T. Harris
Box 448
Virginia State College
Petersburg, Virginia 23803

Dr. Arnold R. Henderson
Box 65
Virginia State College
Petersburg, Virginia 23803

Dr. Walter E. Lowe
Box 464
Virginia State College
Petersburg, Virginia 23803

Dr. Gerald McCants
Box 41
Virginia State College
Petersburg, Virginia 23803

Dr. James T. Guines
V.P.I. & State University
12100 Sunset Hills Road
Reston, Virginia 22090

Dr. H. B. Pinkney
Richmond Public Schools
301 N. 9th Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219

Dr. John Utendale
Department of Education
Western Washington State
College
Bellingham, Washington
98223

Dr. Hollibert Phillips
221 Valley Drive
College Place,
Washington 99324

(Source: University Council for Educational Administration, 29 West Woodruff Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43210)

Appendix B

Institutions Offering
Fellowships for Managers of
Educational Change

Atlanta University
Dr. Stephen C. Herrmann
Professor of Education
223 Chestnut Street, S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30314
(22 black)

Boston College
Dr. John R. Eichorn
Director, Division of Special Education and Rehabilitation
Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts 02167
(1 black)

California State University
Dr. Glen A. Ohlson
1972 Los Altos
San Mateo, California 94402
(6 black)

University of California at Los Angeles
Dr. Jay D. Scribner
Associate Professor of Education
Room 122 Moore Hall
405 Hilgard Avenue
Los Angeles, California 90024
(5 black, 3 Chicano)

University of Colorado
Dr. James S. Rose
Associate Professor of Educational Administration
Boulder, Colorado 80302
(1 black, 1 Chicano)

Fisk University
Dr. Charles Flowers
Assistant to the President for Student Life
Nashville, Tennessee 37203
(18 black)

University of Florida
Ft. K. Forbis Jordan
Professor of Educational Administration
College of Education
Gainesville, Florida 32601
(3 black)

Georgia State University
Dr. J. Frasher
Associate Professor
33 Gilmer Street, S.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30303
(6 black)

University of Iowa
Dr. Willard R. Lane &
Mr. Walter Foley
Educational Administration
College of Education
Iowa City, Iowa 52242
(6 black, 2 Chicano,
1 American-Indian)

University of Louisville
Dr. Roy H. Forbes
Director, Louisville Urban
Education Center
675 River City Mall
Louisville, Kentucky 40202
(8 black)

University of Massachusetts
Dr. George Bryniawsky
Associate Director of Clinic
to Improve University
Teaching
School of Education
Amherst, Massachusetts
01002
(4 black)

University of Maryland
Dr. E. Robert Stephens
Professor & Chairman
Department of
Administration Super-
vision and Curriculum
College Park, Maryland
20742
(3 black, 1 Chicano)

Metropolitan Educational
Council
Dr. Elaine C. Melmed
1610 New Hampshire
Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20009
(17 black)

University of Minnesota
Dr. Charles H. Sederberg,
Director
Bureau of Field Studies &
Surveys
300 Health Service Building
St. Paul Campus
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101
(4 black, 1 Chicano, 2
American-Indian)

University of New Mexico
Dr. Paul A. Pohland,
Chairman
Department of Educational
Administration
College of Education
Albuquerque, New Mexico
87106
(14 Chicano, 7 American-
Indian)

New York University
Dr. Phillip Pitruzzello, Head
Division of Educational Administration
Washington Place, Room 276
New York, New York 10003
(1 black)

University of North Dakota
Dr. Leonard Bearking
Center for Teaching-Learning
Grand Forks, North Dakota 58201
(16 American-Indian)

Northwestern University
Dr. B. J. Chandler
Dean, School of Education
Evanston, Illinois 60201
(9 black, 2 Chicano)

State University of New York
Dr. Oliver Gibson
Department of Educational Administration
Dr. Frederick Gearing
Department of Anthropology
Albany, New York 14214
(4 black, 1 American-Indian)

University of Virginia
Dr. Rolland A. Bowers
Associate Professor
School of Education
Charlottesville, Virginia 22903
(4 black)

Western Michigan University
Dr. Kenneth Simon
Associate Dean
College of Education
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49001
(8 black, 2 Chicano)

(NOTE: Number of minority students appears in parentheses.)

(Source: National Center for Improvement of Educational Systems, 7th and D Streets, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202)

75

Appendix C

Consortium for Educational Leadership
Member Institutions

Atlanta University
Dr. Barbara Jackson
Department of Educational Administration
55 Walnut Street, S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30314
(14 black, 1 Chicano)

University of Chicago
Dr. Philip Jackson
Office of the Chairman
Department of Education
5835 South Kimbark Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60637
(6 black, 1 Oriental)

Claremont Graduate School
Dr. Conrad Briner
Graduate Faculty in Education
900 North College Avenue
Claremont, California 91711
(14 black, 14 Chicano)

Columbia University
Dr. Julio George
Program of Educational Leadership
Department of Educational Administration
Teachers College
525 W. 120th Street
New York, New York 10027
(18 black, 3 Chicano)

University of Massachusetts
Dr. David Flight
Executive Leadership Program
School of Education
Amherst, Massachusetts 01002
(31 black, 11 Chicano, 1 Oriental)

The Ohio State University
Dr. Lonnie Wagstaff
Urban Educational Leadership Program
29 W. Woodruff Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43210
(17 black)

University of Pennsylvania
Dr. William Gomberg
Graduate School of Education
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
(11 black, 1 Oriental)

Consortium for Educational Leadership
Dr. R. Bruce McPherson
Executive Secretary
5801 South Kenwood Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60637

Appendix D

National Program for Educational Leadership Member Institutions

(NOTE: Number of minority students appears in parentheses.)

(Source: Consortium for Educational Leadership, 5801 South Kenwood Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60637)

City University of New York
Dr. Michael Usdan
School of Education
Baruch College
17 Lexington Avenue
New York, New York 10010
(3 black, 1 Chicano)

Claremont Graduate School
Professor Conrad Briner
Claremont, California 91711
(3 black, 2 Chicano)

Fisk University
Professor Nebraska Mays
Department of Education
Nashville, Tennessee 37203
(4 black)

Navajo Community College
Professor John Tippeconic
Many Farms, Arizona 86503
(9 American-Indian)

North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction
Dr. Jerold James
Education Building
(Room 515)
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611
(2 black)

Northwestern University
Professor Lee F. Anderson
School of Education
Room E3-102
2003 Sheridan Road
Evanston, Illinois 60201
(4 black, 2 Chicano)

Ohio State University
Professor William Moore
Department of Educational Administration
Ramseyer Hall
29 W. Woodruff Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43210
(2 black, 1 Oriental)

University of Texas at Austin
Professor Michael P. Thomas, Jr.
Department of Educational Administration
Education Annex F-38
Austin, Texas 78712
(4 Chicano)

(NOTE: Number of minority graduates appears in parentheses.)

(Source: National Program for Educational Leadership, 1712 Neil Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43210)

78